REMARKS

Claims 1, 12 and 22 are amended. Claims 1-33 are pending for consideration. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully traverses the Office's rejections and requests that the application be forwarded on to issuance.

§ 112 Rejections

Claims 11 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Office states that it is unclear whether these claims are dependent or independent claims because claims 1 and 12 are method claims and claims 11 and 20, which depend respectively from these claims, are storage medium claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are not indefinite. Specifically, **claim 11** recites *a computer system* comprising:

> *a storage medium* having stored therein a plurality of executable instructions; and
> *an execution unit*, coupled to the storage medium, *to execute at least a subset of the plurality of executable instructions to implement a method according to claim 1.*

Thus, this claim is directed to an apparatus that comprises instructions on a storage medium that are executable to implement the method of claim 1.

Claim 20 recites a storage medium with executable instructions which implement the method of claim 12.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing indefinite about these claims.

The Patent Office apparently agrees with this assertion as evidenced by the results of a cursory search of the PTO database which uncovered a number of issued patents with claims written in the form objected to by the Office. Specifically, consider U.S. Patent Nos. 6,725,262, 6,716,102, and 6,674,918 exemplary claims of which are reproduced just below.

6,725,262

26. A computer-implemented method of synchronizing a configuration of resources on a plurality of computing devices comprising:

generating a set of lists that describes a configuration of resources that each of a plurality of computing devices should have in order to be synchronized with one another, the configuration of resources defining the content and the settings for each of the computing devices;

sending the set of lists to each of the computing devices;

receiving a response from one or more of the computing devices, each response requesting data that is needed in order to synchronize the configuration of resources for the corresponding computing device;

evaluating the response to determine what data is needed by a particular computing device to synchronize its resources; and

sending the data that is needed by the particular computing device to the computing device so that it can synchronize its resources.

33. *One or more computer-readable media* having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, implement the method of claim 26.

Here, claim 26 recites a computer-implemented method. Claim 33, which depends from claim 26, recites one or more computer-readable media with instructions which, when executed, implement the method of claim 26.

6,716,102

27. A method comprising:

receiving a request to save a game being executed by a gaming system;

saving a graphic representation of the saved game;

saving a descriptive name of the saved game; and

saving a date and time that the game was saved.

34. One or more computer-readable media comprising computer-executable instructions that, when executed, perform the method as recited in claim 27.

Here, claim 27 recites a method. Claim 34, which depends from claim 27, recites one or more computer-readable media with instructions which, when executed, perform the method of claim 27.

6,674,918

1. A computer-implemented method of synthesizing an image from at least two other images comprising:

acquiring a first image that serves as a color source for a resultant image which is to be formed;

acquiring a second image which serves as a perturbation source for the first image;

operating upon a plane that represents the first image by angularly perturbing vectors associated with the plane that represents the first image as a function of aspects of the second image to provide a perturbed image; and

applying an illumination model to the perturbed image to provide a resultant synthesized image.

9. One or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, implement the method of claim 1.

Here, claim 1 recites a computer-implemented method. Claim 9, which depends from claim 1, recites one or more computer-readable media with instructions which, when executed, perform the method of claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing indefinite about these claims. As the Patent Office appears to agree with this assertion, Applicant respectfully traverses the Offices rejection.

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 10, 11 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,226,642 to Beranek et al. (hereinafter "Beranek") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,510,458 to Berstis et al. (hereinafter "Berstis").

Claims 2-9, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Beranek in view of Berstis in further view Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0018506 A1 to McLean et al. (hereinafter "McLean") and U.S. Patent No. 6,253,288 to McAllister.

Claims 12, 13, 16-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Beranek.

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Beranek in view of EP Application No. 0 939 516 A2 to Robinson.

Claims 23-28 and 30-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Beranek in view of Robinson in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,961,602 to Thompson et al. (hereinafter "Thompson") and McLean.

Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Beranek in view of Robinson in further view of Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0026507 A1 to Sears et al. (hereinafter "Sears").

Before discussing the substance of the Office's rejections, the following discussion of Applicant's disclosure and the Beranek reference is provided in an attempt to assist the Office in appreciating the patentable distinctions between Applicant's claimed embodiments and the cited references.

Applicant's Disclosure

Applicant's disclosure, as such pertains to the claimed subject matter, concerns a system and related interfaces supporting the processing of media content. In accordance with various embodiments, a method for processing a *development project* comprises generating a *source chain* for use in a development project, and *caching the source chain* when it is not currently required in the development project. As execution of the development project continues, or during a subsequent project, if the source processing chain is required, it is retrieved from cache, modified as necessary to meet the needs of the development project, and integrated into the development project.

With respect to *development projects* and *source chains*, consider the following. Source processing chains or source chains (also referred to as *filter graphs*), can comprise different types of filters, e.g. source filters, transform filters, and rendering filters. A source filter is typically used to load data from some source; a transform filter processes and passes data; and a rendering filter renders data to a hardware device or other locations (e.g., saved to a file, etc.). An example of a filter graph or source processing chain for a simplistic media rendering process is shown Fig. 1.

The illustrated source chain is comprised of a plurality of filters 102-114, which read, process (transform) and render media content from a selected source

file. As shown, the filter graph includes each of the types of filters described above, interconnected in a linear fashion. Filter graphs, such as the one shown in Fig. 1, can typically be used in the context of user-defined development projects such as multi-media editing projects.

As additional context with respect to user-defined development projects, consider the following in connection with Figs. 9 and 10, which shows a user-defined editing project in accordance with embodiments described in the specification. In this example, when a user creates an editing or development project, they can select from a number of different multimedia clips that they can then assemble into a unique presentation. Each individual clip represents a *source* of digital data or a source stream (e.g., multimedia content). Projects can include one or more sources 902. In defining their project, a user can operate on sources in different ways. For example, video sources can have *transitions* 904 and *effects* 906 applied on them. A transition object is a way to change between two or more sources. A transition essentially receives as input, two or more streams, operates on them in some way, and produces a single output stream. An exemplary transition can comprise, for example, fading from one source to another. An effect object can operate on a single source or on a composite of sources. An effect essentially receives a single input stream, operates on it in some way, and produces a single output stream. An exemplary effect can comprise a black-and-white effect in which a video stream that is configured for presentation in color format is rendered into a video stream that is configured for presentation in black and white format. Effect object 906 may actually perform multiple tasks on the received input stream.

An exemplary user interface 908 is shown and represents what a user might see when they produce a multimedia project with software executing on a computer. In this example, the user has selected three sources A, B, and C, and has assembled the sources into a project timeline. The project timeline defines when the individual sources are to be rendered, as well as when any transitions and/or effects are to occur.

As noted in the specification, conventional implementations of a filter graph manager required a source processing chain be constructed for each access to a source. Thus, a literal implementation of the dynamic graph building feature introduced in the specification might well have the adverse affect of requiring that multiple accesses to a source would require that a commensurate number of processing chains be constructed, i.e., one for each time the filter string was dynamically added to the filter graph. As described in the specification, performance improvements may be achieved by reducing the number of times a processing chain or filter graph is created to retrieve media content from a particular source.

In accordance with at least some embodiments, filter chains can be cached for subsequent use within a development project (e.g. later in the execution of the filter graph) and for use across development projects.

The Beranek Reference

Beranek is directed to method of controlling how a Web document is presented for display on a browser of a Web appliance. The Web appliance typically includes a television class monitor. The Web document typically is formatted according to a markup language such as HTML and the method uses a

client side HTTP caching proxy to intercept the Web document and then dynamically rewrite the document before it is displayed on the browser of the Web appliance. In particular, as the Web document is received from the server, the HTML is parsed to identify the format of the document and the information therein. A filter mechanism is then used to reformat the Web document according to some given protocol, and the re-formatted Web document is then passed to the browser for display on the monitor. As Beranek instructs, dynamic alteration of the HTML in this manner enables control of the "look and feel" of the browser display irrespective of the monitor resolution and/or quality.

At this point, and in view of the discussion of Applicant's disclosure above, what should begin to emerge is an understanding that Applicant's disclosure (and claimed embodiments) and the systems and methods in Beranek are really two very different things, as will become apparent in the discussion below.

Examiner's Traversal of Applicant's Previous Arguments

In the present Office Action, the Examiner responded to Applicant's previous arguments. The Examiner noted, in paragraph 56, that some of the substance of Applicant's arguments did not appear in the language of the claims. Specifically, the Examiner noted that features such as *source processing chains processing and rendering media content* did not appear in the claims.

Applicant maintains its position with respect to Beranek as articulated in the previously-filed response. Nonetheless, independent claims 1, 12 and 22 have been amended in an attempt to clarify the claimed subject matter, as will become apparent below.

The §103 Rejections

Claim 1 has been amended and recites a method comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- loading one or more source processing chains to support execution of a development project, *the source processing chains comprising a series of filters to process and render media content*; and
- determining whether each of the one or more processing chains will be subsequently required during execution of this or another development project and, if so, caching those filter chains which will be subsequently required.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Beranek teaches one or more processing chains (referring to a Web document and citing to column 2, lines 25-50; column 9, lines 7-47; and column 10, lines 21-67). The Office also argues that Beranek teaches a development project (referring to the browser and citing to column 10, lines 21-67; column 2, lines 25-50; and column 13, lines 40-67). The Office also argues that Beranek teaches processing chains (referring to data streams and citing to column 13, lines 40-67). The Office also argues that Beranek teaches execution of development projects citing to column 2, lines 19-53.

Applicant very respectfully disagrees with the Office's interpretation of Beranek and its application to the presently claimed subject matter. Specifically, nowhere does Beranek even remotely disclose or suggest "source processing chains" as that term is utilized in the claims and defined in the specification. Specifically, in the discussion above under the heading "Applicant's Disclosure", Applicant points out, for contextual purposes, characteristics that are associated with exemplary source processing chains. Applicant very respectfully submits

that a "web document" is not a "source processing chain". Nonetheless, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the source processing chains comprise *a series of filters to process and render media content*.

Beranek simply fails to disclose or suggest the subject matter that the Office argues it does. Hence, for at least this reason, the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness and this claim is allowable.

The Office then admits that Beranek does not teach caching filter chains. Applicant must necessarily agree because Beranek does not, in fact, even remotely suggest filter chains as that term is utilized in the specification. The Office then relies on Berstis and argues that Berstis teaches filtering web pages to determine when the web pages are saved to the cache. Applicant must very respectfully again point out that "source processing chains" are not "web documents". This notion has been clarified by the amendment to this claim. Thus, to this extent, Berstis's teachings are simply irrelevant. Hence, for at least this additional reason, this claim is allowable as the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another. Given the allowability of these claims in view of the misinterpretation and application of Beranek and Berstis, the rejections based on the further combinations with McLean and McAllister are not seen to add anything of significance.

Claim 12 has been amended and recites a method comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- generating a source chain for use in a development project, *the source chain comprising a series of filters to process and render media content*; and
- caching the source chain when it is not currently required in the development project.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office relies solely upon Beranek and argues that it discloses source chains and development projects as those terms are utilized in the specification. As noted above, Applicant very respectfully disagrees with the Office and submits that the Office has misinterpreted Beranek. Specifically, Beranek's web documents and browser are simply not, respectively, "source chains" and "development projects", as those terms are defined in the claims and specification. Nonetheless, this claim has been amended to clarify that the source chain *comprises a series of filters to process and render media content*.

Accordingly, the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness and this claim is allowable.

Claims 13-21 depend from claim 12 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 12, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another. In addition, given the allowability of these claims in view of the misinterpretation and application of Beranek, the rejections based on the further

combinations with McLean and McAllister are not seen to add anything of significance.

Claim 22 has been amended and recites a system comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- a plurality of sources; and
- an interface, selectively coupled to the plurality of sources, to generate and implement a development project of processing chains, wherein the interface loads a processing chain for each of the plurality of media sources at a point during the execution of the project when the chain is required, and wherein the interface is configured to unload at least a subset of the chains when they are not required, *the processing chains comprising a series of filters to process and render media content*.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Beranek discloses processing chains (citing to Beranek's web documents) and a development project (citing to Beranek's browser). As noted above, this is simply not the case. For reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office has misinterpreted and misapplied Beranek. Specifically, Beranek's web documents are not processing chains. Nonetheless, Applicant has amended this claim to clarify that the *processing chains comprise a series of filters to process and render media content*.

Accordingly, the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness and this claim is allowable. In view of the Office's misinterpretation of Beranek, the rejection of this claim based on the combination with Robinson is not seen to add anything of significance.

Claims 23-33 depend from claim 22 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 22, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another. In addition, given the allowability of these claims in view of the misinterpretation and application of Beranek, the rejections based on the further combinations with Thompson, McLean, Anderson, Sears and McAllister are not seen to add anything of significance.

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance and Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. In the event that the Office's next action is anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests that the undersigned be contacted for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 8/30/04

By: Lance R. Sadler
Reg. No. 38,605
(509) 324-9256